

R E M A R K S

1. Reconsideration and further prosecution of the above-identified application are respectfully requested in view of the discussion that follows. Claims 1, 3, 4 and 8 are pending in this application. The specification has been objected to for certain informalities. Claims 1, 3, 4 and 8 have been objected to for certain informalities. Claims 1, 3 and 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,656,156 to Yamashita et al. Claim 4 has been indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form. After a careful review of the claims, as amended, it has been concluded that the rejections are in error and the rejections are therefore traversed.
2. The specification and claims have been objected to. In response, the specification and claims has been corrected, as suggested by the Examiner.
3. Claim 4 has been indicated as allowable if rewritten independent form. Accordingly, claim 4 has been rewritten as suggested.
4. Claims 1, 3 and 8 have been rejected under as being anticipated by Yamashita et al. In response, the separator has

been further limited to "a separator with an external control of manual operation operable from the outside". Support for the additional limitation may be found in the specification at page 12, line 11 and page 18, lines 14-15.

In addition, FIGs. 7 and 8 show a controlling part 14 of the separator (9') that extends into the area between the ratchet (1') and crown (2') that allows the disengagement of the cogs of the ratchet and crown. The separator (9') includes a wedge 15 that provides external manual control of the separator (9') and that is manually operable from outside the mechanism formed by the combination of the crown (2') and ratchet (1').

In contrast, Yamashita et al. shows a releasing body 3 that is disposed between the arms 1, 2 and that fails to provide any mechanism for manual operation of the releasing body from the outside. Since Yamashita et al. fails to teach or suggest this claim limitation, any rejection based upon Yamashita et al. would now be improper and should be withdrawn.

5. Allowance of claims 1, 3, 4 and 8, as now presented, is believed to be in order and such action is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of the subject application, he is respectfully requested to telephone applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

WELSH & KATZ, LTD.

By



Jon P. Christensen

Registration No. 34,137

January 22, 2004
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.
120 South Riverside Plaza
22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 655-1500